

Doggett Lantos  
Dooley Levin  
Doyle Lewis (GA)  
Durbin Lincoln  
Edwards Lipinski  
Engel Lofgren  
Eshoo Lowey  
Evans Luther  
Farr Maloney  
Fattah Manton  
Fazio Markey  
Fields (LA) Martinez  
Filner Mascara  
Flake Matsui  
Foglietta McCarthy  
Ford McDermott  
Frank (MA) McHale  
Frost McKinney  
Furse McNulty  
Gejdenson Meehan  
Gephardt Meek  
Gonzalez Menendez  
Gordon Mfume  
Green Miller (CA)  
Gutierrez Mineta  
Hall (OH) Minge  
Harman Mink  
Hastings (FL) Mollohan  
Hayes Montgomery  
Hefner Moran  
Hilliard Murtha  
Hinchey Nadler  
Holden Neal  
Hoyer Oberstar  
Jackson-Lee Obey  
Jacobs Olver  
Jefferson Ortiz  
Johnson (SD) Owens  
Johnson, E. B. Pallone  
Johnston Pastor  
Kanjorski Payne (NJ)  
Kaptur Payne (VA)  
Kennedy (MA) Pelosi  
Kennedy (RI) Peterson (FL)  
Kennelly Peterson (MN)  
Kildee Pickett  
Klecзка Pomeroy  
Klink Poshard  
LaFalce Rahall

Rangel  
Reed  
Richardson  
Rivers  
Roemer  
Rose  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanders  
Sawyer  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Scott  
Serrano  
Sisisky  
Skaggs  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stenholm  
Stokes  
Studds  
Stupak  
Tanner  
Tejeda  
Thompson  
Thornton  
Thurman  
Torres  
Torrice  
Towns  
Tucker  
Velazquez  
Graham Greenwood  
Gunderson  
Gutknecht  
Hall (TX)  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Heineman  
Herger  
Hilleary  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Istook  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, Sam

Doolittle  
Dornan  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
English  
Ensign  
Everett  
Ewing  
Fawell  
Fields (TX)  
Foley  
Forbes  
Fowler  
Fox  
Franks (CT)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frisa  
Funderburk  
Longley  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gekas  
Geren  
Gilchrist  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gingrich  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Goss  
Graham  
Greenwood  
Gunderson  
Gutknecht  
Hall (TX)  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Heineman  
Herger  
Hilleary  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Istook  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, Sam

Regula  
Riggs  
Roberts  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roth  
Roukema  
Royce  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaefer  
Schiff  
Seastrand  
Sensenbrenner  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shuster  
Skeen  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Solomon  
Souder  
Spence  
Stearns  
Stockman  
Stump  
Talent  
Tanner  
Tate  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Torkildsen  
Upton  
Vucanovich  
Waldholtz  
Walker  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
White  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wolf  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

Buyer Moakley Waxman  
Dornan Orton  
Gibbons Reynolds

NOT VOTING—7

□ 1616

Mr. COYNE changed his vote from "aye" to "no."  
Mr. MCINTOSH changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to table was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.  
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 194, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 458]

YEAS—239

Allard Boehner Chrysler  
Archer Bonilla Chinger  
Army Bono Coble  
Bachus Brownback Coburn  
Baker (CA) Bryant (TN)  
Baker (LA) Bunn  
Ballenger Bunning Condit  
Barr Burr Cooley  
Barrett (NE) Burton Cox  
Bartlett Buyer Crane  
Barton Callahan Crapo  
Bass Calvert Cremeans  
Bateman Camp Cubin  
Bereuter Canady Cunningham  
Bilbray Castle  
Bilirakis Chabot Deal  
Bliley Chambliss DeLay  
Blute Chenoweth Diaz-Balart  
Boehler Christensen Dickey

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Andrews  
Baesler  
Baldacci  
Barcia  
Barrett (WI)  
Becerra  
Beilenson  
Bentsen  
Berman  
Bevill  
Bishop  
Bonior  
Borski  
Boucher  
Brewster  
Browder  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Bryant (TX)  
Cardin  
Chapman  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Coleman  
Collins (IL)  
Collins (MI)  
Conyers  
Costello  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Danner

NAYS—194

de la Garza  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
Dellums  
Deutsch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Durbin  
Edwards  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fazio  
Fields (LA)  
Filner  
Flake  
Flanagan  
Foglietta  
Ford  
Frank (MA)  
Frost  
Furse  
Gejdenson  
Gephardt  
Gibbons  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Green  
Gutierrez  
Hall (OH)

Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McDermott  
McHale  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek  
Menendez  
Mfume  
Miller (CA)  
Mineta  
Minge  
Mink  
Mollohan  
Moran  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Neal  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Orton  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pastor  
Payne (NJ)

Payne (VA)  
Pelosi  
Peterson (FL)  
Peterson (MN)  
Pickett  
Pomeroy  
Poshard  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reed  
Richardson  
Rivers  
Roemer  
Rose  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanders  
Sawyer  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Scott  
Serrano  
Sisisky  
Skaggs  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Spratt  
Stark

NOT VOTING—2  
Reynolds

Moakley  
□ 1629  
So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1630

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 310 AND H.R. 313

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 310 and H.R. 313.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1868, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-167) on the resolution (H. Res. 177) providing for the further consideration in the Committee of the Whole of the bill (H.R. 1868) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE, FOR ANTI-TERRORISM INITIATIVES, FOR ASSISTANCE IN THE RECOVERY FROM THE TRAGEDY THAT OCCURRED AT OKLAHOMA CITY, AND RESCISSIONS ACT, 1995

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call

up House Resolution 176 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 176

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1944) making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance, for anti-terrorism initiatives, for assistance in the recovery from the tragedy that occurred at Oklahoma City, and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes. It shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, to consider an amendment offered by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. That amendment (if offered) shall be considered as read and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on that amendment (if offered) and on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Woodland Hills, CA [Mr. BEILEN-SON], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of H.R. 1944, which largely consists of the rescission and supplemental appropriations contained in the conference report for H.R. 1158. The bill was vetoed by the President 4½ weeks ago. It was the first veto of his presidency. Unfortunately, there remain enough defenders of the status quo in this House that an override of that veto would have been impossible.

Facing an impasse, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has been striving to find a compromise with the administration in order to provide needed disaster relief to 40 States, and to place a down payment on our balanced budget, which we have just been debating here over the past hour.

This modified closed rule, Mr. Speaker, provides for consideration of the bill that can break that impasse, with 1 hour of general debate in the House. The rule permits the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to offer

one amendment, which shall be considered as read and shall not be subject to amendment or division. The rule waives all points of order against the amendment. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Members that in California, the message from the President's veto of H.R. 1158 was received loudly and clearly. The President talked a lot last year about standing behind the families, rebuilding their lives after facing the worst that nature could possibly throw at them. The Northridge earthquake was devastating for southern California, and I shall never forget the President's visit to that region, and how moved he was by those who were victimized.

Unfortunately, his veto pen spoke louder than those words, telling struggling communities that if providing assistance meant cutting his sacred Federal spending programs, that disaster relief really was not all that important.

H.R. 1944 is the product of the tireless effort of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to send a compromise bill to the President. The bill restores funding to a number of the education, training, and housing programs that the President said were the basis for his veto.

The language on striker replacement incorporated in H.R. 1158 was also dropped from this bill. As we know, the first time around the White House did not engage in negotiations on the rescission conference report until after the process was completed. No one in the administration was at all involved in the negotiating process. Instead, they waited until the process was completely over to issue a veto threat.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations reports that the administration has simply refused to come to closure on numerous provisions under endless negotiation.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the President to stop letting perfection be the enemy of the good. The rescissions most objectionable to the President have been addressed. They have been replaced with other spending reductions. H.R. 1944 will provide \$6.7 billion for much needed disaster relief in 40 States. It is not just California, this impacts 40 States. The bill also continues to place a \$9.2 billion downpayment on deficit reduction, which obviously is a goal to which we all seem to aspire, and that was evident from the debate on both sides of the aisle on the budget.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve to know that the very responsible spending reductions in this bill, which account for a 1-percent reduction in fiscal year 1995 Federal outlays, are the product of a thorough, a very thorough review process conducted for months by members of the Committee on Appropriations.

I have said it before and I will say it again, the criteria used by the committee are clear, concise, and utterly reasonable to the American taxpayer. Rescissions were proposed when programs were not authorized, were duplicative, received large funding increases in fiscal year 1995, had unspent funds piling up from year to year, exceeded spending levels in the Clinton budget, and were wasteful or did not work.

Mr. Speaker, the President killed the balanced budget amendment by encouraging Senators in his party to flip-flop and oppose that amendment. The President opposed the specific balanced budget plans offered by the Republican majorities in both Houses of Congress. The President vetoed H.R. 1158 that started the country down the path towards a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, some cynics might conclude that the President can talk the talk but not walk the walk when it comes to controlling Federal spending. Even though the original objections to the rescission bill have been addressed in H.R. 1944, some administration officials are indicating that the bill just may be vetoed once again.

I would especially note that some in the administration consider minimal disagreements regarding the proper way to dispose of dead and rotting trees on Federal lands to be an excuse to kill this bill. Those people either have their priorities seriously misplaced, or this administration could never find a serious spending reduction plan that the President could possibly sign.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this very fair and balanced rule for a very important bill that has come from the Committee on Appropriations. Once again, it will be up to the President to make the case that, despite all of his original concerns being met, that a 1-percent cut in the \$1.5 trillion in Federal outlays is too much for him to accept in order to fund much needed disaster relief.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the record the following document regarding the amendment process and special rules.

The document referred to is as follows:

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,<sup>1</sup> 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of June 28, 1995]

| Rule type                       | 103d Congress   |                  | 104th Congress  |                  |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|
|                                 | Number of rules | Percent of total | Number of rules | Percent of total |
| Open/Modified-open <sup>2</sup> | 46              | 44               | 31              | 71               |
| Modified Closed <sup>3</sup>    | 49              | 47               | 12              | 27               |
| Closed <sup>4</sup>             | 9               | 9                | 1               | 2                |

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,<sup>1</sup> 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS—Continued

[As of June 28, 1995]

| Rule type | 103d Congress   |                  | 104th Congress  |                  |
|-----------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|
|           | Number of rules | Percent of total | Number of rules | Percent of total |
| Totals:   | 104             | 100              | 44              | 100              |

<sup>1</sup> This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

<sup>2</sup> An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

<sup>3</sup> A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

<sup>4</sup> A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of June 28, 1995]

| H. Res. No. (Date rept.) | Rule type | Bill No.        | Subject  | Disposition of rule               |
|--------------------------|-----------|-----------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)     | O         | H.R. 5          | Unfunded Mandate Reform                        | A: 350-71 (1/19/95)               |
| H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)     | MC        | H. Con. Res. 17 | Social Security                                | A: 255-172 (1/25/95)              |
|                          |           | H.J. Res. 1     | Balanced Budget Amdt.                          |                                   |
| H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)     | O         | H.R. 101        | Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians             | A: voice vote (2/1/95)            |
| H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)     | O         | H.R. 400        | Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve | A: voice vote (2/1/95)            |
| H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)     | O         | H.R. 440        | Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif           | A: voice vote (2/1/95)            |
| H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)      | O         | H.R. 2          | Line Item Veto                                 | A: voice vote (2/2/95)            |
| H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)      | O         | H.R. 665        | Victim Restitution                             | A: voice vote (2/7/95)            |
| H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)      | O         | H.R. 666        | Exclusionary Rule Reform                       | A: voice vote (2/7/95)            |
| H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)      | MO        | H.R. 667        | Violent Criminal Incarceration                 | A: voice vote (2/9/95)            |
| H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)      | O         | H.R. 668        | Criminal Alien Deportation                     | A: voice vote (2/10/95)           |
| H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)     | MO        | H.R. 728        | Law Enforcement Block Grants                   | A: voice vote (2/13/95)           |
| H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)     | MO        | H.R. 7          | National Security Revitalization               | PQ: 229-100; A: 227-127 (2/15/95) |
| H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)     | MC        | H.R. 831        | Health Insurance Deductibility                 | PQ: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95) |
| H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)     | O         | H.R. 830        | Paperwork Reduction Act                        | A: voice vote (2/22/95)           |
| H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)     | MC        | H.R. 889        | Defense Supplemental                           | A: 282-144 (2/22/95)              |
| H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)     | MO        | H.R. 450        | Regulatory Transition Act                      | A: 252-175 (2/23/95)              |
| H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)     | MO        | H.R. 1022       | Risk Assessment                                | A: 253-165 (2/27/95)              |
| H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)    | O         | H.R. 926        | Regulatory Reform and Relief Act               | A: voice vote (2/28/95)           |
| H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)    | MO        | H.R. 925        | Private Property Protection Act                | A: 271-151 (3/2/95)               |
| H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)     | MO        | H.R. 988        | Attorney Accountability Act                    | A: voice vote (3/6/95)            |
| H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)     | MO        | H.R. 1058       | Securities Litigation Reform                   |                                   |
| H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)     | MO        |                 |  | A: 257-155 (3/7/95)               |
| H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)     | Debate    | H.R. 956        | Product Liability Reform                       | A: voice vote (3/8/95)            |
| H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)     | MC        |                 |  | PQ: 234-191; A: 247-181 (3/9/95)  |
| H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)    | MO        | H.R. 1159       | Making Emergency Supp. Appropriations          | A: 242-190 (3/15/95)              |
| H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)    | MC        | H.J. Res. 73    | Term Limits Const. Amdt.                       | A: voice vote (3/28/95)           |
| H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)    | Debate    | H.R. 4          | Personal Responsibility Act of 1995            | A: voice vote (3/21/95)           |
| H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)    | MC        |                 |  | A: 217-211 (3/22/95)              |
| H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)     | O         | H.R. 1271       | Family Privacy Protection Act                  | A: 423-1 (4/4/95)                 |
| H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)     | O         | H.R. 660        | Older Persons Housing Act                      | A: voice vote (4/6/95)            |
| H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)     | MC        | H.R. 1215       | Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995   | A: 228-204 (4/5/95)               |
| H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)     | MC        | H.R. 483        | Medicare Select Expansion                      | A: 253-172 (4/6/95)               |
| H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)     | O         | H.R. 655        | Hydrogen Future Act of 1995                    | A: voice vote (5/2/95)            |
| H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)     | O         | H.R. 1361       | Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996                      | A: voice vote (5/9/95)            |
| H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)     | O         | H.R. 961        | Clean Water Amendments                         | A: 414-4 (5/10/95)                |
| H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)    | O         | H.R. 535        | Fish Hatchery—Arkansas                         | A: voice vote (5/15/95)           |
| H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)    | O         | H.R. 584        | Fish Hatchery—Iowa                             | A: voice vote (5/15/95)           |
| H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)    | O         | H.R. 614        | Fish Hatchery—Minnesota                        | A: voice vote (5/15/95)           |
| H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)    | MC        | H. Con. Res. 67 | Budget Resolution FY 1996                      | PQ: 252-170; A: 255-168 (5/17/95) |
| H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)    | MO        | H.R. 1561       | American Overseas Interests Act                | A: 233-176 (5/23/95)              |
| H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)     | MC        | H.R. 1530       | Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996                     | PQ: 225-191; A: 233-183 (6/13/95) |
| H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)    | O         | H.R. 1817       | MilCon Appropriations FY 1996                  | PQ: 223-180; A: 245-155 (6/16/95) |
| H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)    | MC        | H.R. 1854       | Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996                   | PQ: 232-196; A: 236-191 (6/20/95) |
| H. Res. 170 (6/20/95)    | O         | H.R. 1868       | For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996                     | PQ: 221-178; A: 217-175 (6/22/95) |
| H. Res. 171 (6/22/95)    | O         | H.R. 1905       | Energy & Water Approps. FY 1996                |                                   |
| H. Res. 173 (6/27/95)    | C         | H.J. Res. 79    | Flag Constitutional Amendment                  | PQ: 258-170; A: 271-152 (6/28/95) |
| H. Res. 176 (6/28/95)    | MC        | H.R. 1944       | Emer. Supp. Approps                            |                                   |

Codes: O-open rule; MO-modified open rule; MC-modified closed rule; C-closed rule; A-adoption vote; PQ-previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we do not oppose the rule, but we are troubled by the manner in which this bill is being brought forth for consideration by the House.

We understand the majority's desire to expedite consideration of this new version of H.R. 1158, the emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions bill. However, Members have had virtually no opportunity to see the revised bill that this rule makes in order.

The bill has not been considered by, or reported from, the Appropriations Committee. From what we understand, no minority Members of the House have been involved in developing the new legislation. In fact, it appears that only a very few Members have had a role in negotiating this new bill.

While we understand that this is not an unusual process for making revisions

to an appropriations bill, I simply want to point out that we are, in fact, considering a new bill that has had very little consideration, by only a few Members, up to this point.

Furthermore, the rule permits an amendment to be offered by Mr. LIVINGSTON, which is apparently intended to allow him to offer compromise language on the so-called salvage timber provision that was in the original bill. That allows a change to one of the most contentious provisions in the bill to be considered by the House with virtually no opportunity to review this important matter in advance.

Beyond our concerns with this rule, many of us oppose the bill that it makes in order for the same reasons that we opposed the original version of the legislation, H.R. 1158. Although H.R. 1944 is a modest improvement over the first bill, it still contains large spending cuts in many valuable programs.

Furthermore, like H.R. 1158, this bill continues to combine in one bill both

emergency disaster assistance and spending cuts, which does a grave injustice to the victims of the Northridge earthquake and other federally declared disasters. It has made the provision of the relief they need dependent upon cutting spending for housing assistance for the elderly, for education and job training, for veterans, for environmental protection, and for a great number of other valuable programs which serve many of our Nation's pressing needs.

Back in March, when the House considered the first rescissions bill, we predicted that pairing emergency disaster assistance with spending cuts—in essence, holding disaster assistance hostage to the politics of cutting spending—would likely delay the provision of emergency funds. That is exactly what has happened. It is now the end of June, and we still have not passed the emergency funding that is needed by the Federal Emergency Management Agency and other federal

agencies to meet the needs of disaster victims.

The delay in approval of this bill stands in stark contrast to Congress' quick response to the provision of funds for disaster assistance when we did not insist upon including controversial spending cuts—as well as controversial unrelated legislation, such as the salvage timber provision—in an emergency disaster assistance bill. Members may recall that the original \$10 billion disaster-relief package for the Northridge earthquake was signed into law in less than one month after the earthquake struck on January 17 of last year. Our rapid response to that disaster was possible only because we deliberately refrained from including controversial spending cuts in the same legislation.

Mr. Speaker, to repeat: we do not object to this rule, but we urge Members to vote "no" on the bill it makes in order.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to my good friend, the gentleman from California, that he is absolutely right. It is much, much easier to deal with disasters by simply adding to the deficit. It is tougher.

However, the message that came through last November 8 was that business as usual has obviously got to come to an end. We had a big debate in the 103rd Congress on the issue of whether or not we would have offsets to deal with the Northridge earthquake. We lost that battle when it came up here.

Now, in the 104th Congress, with this new majority, we have made the determination that when we deal with these very tragic situations and we want to provide emergency assistance, we are only going to do it if we find offsets, and that is what we have done here, and we have successfully been able to more than offset the cost of the Northridge quake and the disasters that have taken place in 40 other States.

Mr. Speaker, I also should add that this bill is virtually identical to H.R. 1158, which has been considered by this House, exhaustive hearings on the issue, and we are simply making changes to try and address the concerns of the President, so we can get this measure signed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my good friend, the gentleman from Savannah, GA [Mr. KINGSTON].

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. This bill is a modest cut in the fiscal year 1995 budget. It reduces the budget by about 1 percent, or \$9.3 billion. It is not big money.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of important programs that have been reduced as a result of this. Yet, these are the

tough decisions that we have to make, because the American people have asked us to get our House in order. The President, of course, vetoed the first bill. He vetoed it because he was not satisfied with the cuts. He felt the cuts were too deep in education and training programs for the elderly, and in environmental programs and the salvage timber provisions.

□ 1645

What we have done in this bill is we went back and addressed his concerns. We did not cut these programs as much as we originally did in the first rescission bill. Yet even doing so, there still seems to be a void in the debate from the White House. We do not have a clear indication that they are going to support this bill, nor do we have a clear indication that they are going to veto the bill.

It is somewhat disappointing because my question would be to those who are in opposition to this bill, if not these cuts, which cuts? And if not now, when? That is not a profound statement, but it is something that we have to come around on. It is already late June. We have been debating this bill now for almost 6 months, and we still have yet to see a proposal, a concrete proposal from the White House about addressing these things.

I stand in support of it. Yet I do hope, now that things are kind of loosening up on Pennsylvania Avenue, the President has submitted a balanced budget, hopefully he will come in now and enter this rescission debate at least by supporting this.

The disaster money. The disaster money is necessary. We have flooding all over the country, particularly in Georgia, but Oklahoma City gets anti-terrorism measures paid for. We have already talked about the earthquake. These are important items.

This bill would save more money if it was not for the disasters, but as we know, Mr. Speaker, these disasters happen. We do not have a special fund set aside for them. We probably should do that at some point, but right now we do not. We have to reduce the budget, the spending, in order to help pay for some of these disasters. Again, these are tough decisions, but they are decisions that have to be made.

Let me conclude with this: It has been said that this rescission is too severe on the students, it is too severe on the elderly, it is too severe on the environment. But I would say that if you want to protect the environment, if you want to help out the students, if you want to protect the senior citizens, then you have to be sure that this country stays afloat.

In order to do so, we cannot continuously have deficit spending and overspending and spending on unauthorized projects, and continue to face the children and the senior citizens and the middle class of America and say, "We overspent, but we're going to get somebody else to pay for it." It is time for

us to come around and say, "You know, we're going to have to cut back a little bit in order to be there for you tomorrow."

I believe that this rescission bill, Mr. Speaker, is a responsible step in that direction. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and then vote for the bill.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose that our Republican colleagues offer this bill in the spirit of the season. It is, of course, the season of television reruns, and this bill is a bit of a rerun, at least as regards the tactic that is employed because it has something in common with the approach that our colleagues have used with reference to the task force to cut Social Security or, rather, to cut Medicare—Social Security is probably next in line—the same approach that was used to prepare to stack the committees that will impact and implement the budget resolution, and now this approach.

They all have one thing in common: They rerun stealth, they rerun secrecy. It was Justice Brandeis who suggested that sunlight is the best disinfectant, that electric light is the best policeman, but his wisdom seems to have been lost on our colleagues, for it is for some reason that they hide their light under a bushel.

At 11 last night this bill was presented to the Committee on Rules. All 119 pages of this piece of legislation, which according to the bill as filed were apparently just introduced yesterday, were presented at 11 last night, so that somewhere near midnight this bill was voted out of the Committee on Rules.

I don't know if many Members of this House even know what is in this 119 pages. Indeed, we have been told by the distinguished gentleman from California that it is virtually identical to legislation that we have considered in this House before. I don't know what parts are identical, given the short period here, but I know one part that is not identical.

The vast majority of the Members of this House, when this bill was in front of us last time, voted to put a lock box on this piece of legislation to ensure that every dollar of cuts went to deficit reduction. I am advised, though I could not find it in the 119 pages, that that virtually identical provision is no longer in here. What is in here are contingent cuts to some of our education programs that I think are very vital.

I really liked the idea on day one in this Congress that we were going to

shake the piece up, that there was going to be a real revolution with regard to change and how business is conducted here. Yet this piece of legislation comes out, not in the bright light of day but, rather, at the midnight hour, coming back to us without ever having a hearing in front of the substantive committee but, rather, having been considered here in the midst of lengthy debate last night and presented on only a few hours' notice, and without one of the provisions that received really bipartisan support when this measure was in front of the House, that provision being the lock box provision.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

I would like to ask him to turn to page 105 of the bill H.R. 1944 and look at section 2003. It is entitled "Downward Adjustments in Discretionary Spending Limits." The lock box is included in this measure, I would say to my friend.

Mr. DOGGETT. Let me just inquire there, because if I have misstated it and it includes the lock box, that would be great. So every penny that is saved in this bill will go to deficit reduction and only deficit reduction, and not to pay for a tax hike?

Mr. DREIER. The lock box is included in this bill. If the gentleman would read section 2003, it is included in this measure. I would simply like to say that as we look at this new day, the negotiations which my friend says have not taken place in the light of day, we are simply trying to address the concerns of President Clinton, a member of your party. We want to work together with him so that we can get a bill that we can sign.

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman. I am glad to hear the lock box is in here.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, is there not a rule in the House or at least a practice in the House that prohibits Members from wearing pins while they are addressing the House from the well?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct. Members should not wear badges or other indications of their positions on the floor.

Mr. WALKER. So the gentleman who just spoke prior to this was in fact in violation of the procedures of the House when he addressed the House; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise all of the Members that Members should not wear badges or other insignia while addressing the House.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my friend, the gentleman from Metarie, LA [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I thank my friend from California for yielding me the time. After listening to the debate of the last several minutes, I think I am watching a replay of Fantasy Island.

The gentleman from Texas ought to know that this bill is virtually word-for-word the very same bill as the conference report adopted by the House of Representatives May 18. In fact, he says it is a replay. It is a replay.

The only difference is those issues which were raised by the President of the United States, a member of his party, who resides over at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, which has been blocked off from traffic, incidentally. Perhaps that is why the gentleman did not know it. Maybe he could not get over there.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The gentleman has had his chance to speak and I am replying to the gentleman. I will yield to him after I am done. I will be happy to yield to him then.

The point is, if the gentleman would speak with the White House and the representatives of his party and the chief of staff of the White House, he would understand that this is virtually the same bill as the original bill, H.R. 1158, with the exception of those items that the White House was interested in changing.

The fact is this is a good effort. We debated it at length earlier in the year. The effort provides for funding for the Oklahoma bombing disaster in supplemental funding. It provides for supplemental funding for flood and fire and earthquake and pestilence that hit California and virtually 39 other States.

It provides for the funding that the President of the United States himself asked for debt relief for Jordan, in order to help resolve the Middle East conflict.

It provide for the placement of tens of thousands of people in the Northwest back in jobs that currently are lying fallow. They are just not in existence right now, but they would be. Those people would be working if this bill would pass and get the President's signature, because in fact all of those forests that were burned out in the last year and a half would be available for lumbering. Trees that were burned out could be salvaged and sent to the lumber mills and people could go to work.

The gentleman, if he had taken the time to examine H.R. 1158 would know fundamentally what is in H.R. 1944, is the same bill, except for the fact that there is additional money for job training, School-to-Work, Goals 2000, Safe and Drug Free Schools, National Community Service, safe drinking water, community development, and so forth, things that the President asked for.

There is one other major facet of H.R. 1158 that also is a replay in H.R. 1944. It is over \$9.1 billion in net savings over and above the \$7 billion in additional supplemental spending requested by this President, savings to the American taxpayer in fiscal year 1995.

Why is that significant? Because the majority in the House of Representatives and the majority in the Senate has said they can balance the budget within 7 years, even though the President in February gave us a budget that said he did not want to balance the budget between now and infinity, because he projected \$200 billion in deficits every year from now on, has now decided that he wants to balance the budget within 10 years.

If he wants to balance the budget in 10 years, guess where the best place to start is? Fiscal year 1995. He could have done it by signing H.R. 1158, which he has already vetoed, or by signing H.R. 1944, which does essentially the same thing.

Here he is getting disaster funding for floods that he asked for, funding for earthquakes that he asked for, funding for fire that he asked for, funding for Jordan that he asked for, funding for Oklahoma that he asked for. He is getting the opportunity to send tens of thousands of people in the Northwest back to work in the timber mills that presumably he wants, I would hope that he want that, and he is saving the American taxpayer over \$9.1 billion in unspent 1995 funds.

If this bill does not pass, as presumably the gentleman in the well might favor, them those savings will not occur. That funding for flood, fire, earthquake, Oklahoma bombing and Jordan would not be had. Those tens of thousands of people would not go back to the lumber mills, and would not be employed, and the gentleman could sit around and smile, and we would probably have to cut mercilessly in the fiscal year 1996 every one of the appropriation bills in order to meet our target to ultimately balance the budget by the year 2002. Just as mercilessly, frankly, in order to accomplish the President's goals to balance the budget by the year 2005.

I suggest to the gentleman, he can continue to cry about not knowing what is in this bill, but if he would like to know about 99 percent of what is in the bill, all he has to do is look at H.R. 1158 which presumably he would know about, since the President has taken the time to veto it.

I just am terribly concerned. This bill really should not be the subject of partisan politics. It should be a bipartisan effort, because it is not Republican people who are going to go back to the sawmills, or Democrat people. It is the American people. It is not Republicans or Democrats who are going to benefit from flood and fire and earthquake relief. It is the American people. It is not Republicans who were devastated in the Oklahoma bombing or Democrats

that were devastated. It is Oklahoma, American people that were devastated.

□ 1700

And they will all be assisted by this bill and, of course, it will be Republicans and Democrats, men, women and children throughout America that will benefit by the \$9.2 billion in savings.

So I would hope, I would hope the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] would stop posturing politically, take the time to read the bill, and when the gentleman does, endorse it. Endorse it. Get Members of his party to vote for it. Let us get it out of the House. Let us send it to the Senate and then let us send it to the President for his signature, not his veto as he did the last bill of this sort.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time briefly to say that the very distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has spoken a little longer than I had anticipated and I would hope that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] might be able to get some time.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, responding to the altar call of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and agreeing with his appeal for bipartisanship, since last night I only got to 103, and your colleague pointed me to 104.

Just tell me if on page 104, the provision to which the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] referred me, is that the same language that a bipartisan majority of this House, an overwhelming majority, approved? The language offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER]; is that language here?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT], it is the exact language that passed in H.R. 1158. It is the language that was sponsored by Senator BYRD. It is not the Brewster language.

Mr. DOGGETT. It is not the Brewster language. It is not the Brewster lockbox. That is the 1 percent that is different that some of us think is very important.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] has 24 minutes remaining and the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to try to restore an atmosphere in which perhaps Members will absorb a

little more information and a little less heat at the same time.

First of all, let me say to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] my good friend who is the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, that after this is over, I would suggest that we both go have a sedative somewhere. I think we need it.

But let me say that I would respectfully point out that the problem that the gentleman is having with the Clinton administration is not due to numbers, as he knows. The problem is because the gentleman's party leadership decided that they were going to use the appropriations process, which is supposed to be used for budget matters, they decided to use that process instead to bulldoze through the Congress major changes in environmental laws.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to partially favor one of those changes. But I do not favor disrupting the entire budget process of the United States in order to accomplish it. As the gentleman very well knows, that is the major bone of contention, or at least one of the major bones of contention, between the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and the Clinton administration right now; not their lack of desire to cut the deficit.

Now, let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I think when we had the last election and the public decided to put our good Republican friends in control for the first time in a long time, I think they did that because out of desperation they thought that that just might force both parties to work together, whether they liked it or not.

I would suggest that last night in the midst of swirling partisanship on other matters, this committee, the Committee on Appropriations, managed to work its way through a very contentious appropriation bill that deals with our international responsibilities in a very nonpartisan, bipartisan way. I wish that that were happening on the budget, but it is not.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is not because I think the product that is being produced on the budget is at great variance from that which the public expected when they voted in November. I think they wanted us to have an attack on the deficit. They wanted us to have an attack on waste. They wanted us to have an understanding that programs needed to be as well managed as they were well meaning. Instead, I think what they are getting is something that has come down to a near war on kids, on students, and on seniors.

The fundamental problem with this bill is that it is almost the same bill that it was when it left the House. It has been changed by about \$700 million from the conference report that the President vetoed; \$700 million or so out of a \$16 billion bill and it is largely a bill which takes away from seniors and takes away from education in order to finance a very large tax cut for some very rich people.

The Brewster amendment has been mentioned. The Brewster amendment

was the effort by our party to see to it that every dollar in this bill was used for deficit reduction, not for tax breaks that rich people don't need.

The Brewster amendment passed with less than 10 dissenting votes in this House and then one day after it passed, we were told by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], chairman of the Committee on the Budget, that after all, that was just a game to get votes to pass this vehicle.

Indeed, the language which was adopted in conference provides about \$5 billion in deficit reduction in terms of outlays from the first year's savings in this bill. But it provides between \$130 and \$140 billion in money to be used for that tax cut and 50 percent of that tax cut is going to the wealthiest people in this country, people who make more than \$100,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have anything against rich people. I would like everybody to be rich. That is the American dream. But I want to tell you why I do not think America's No. 1 need is to feed the desires of rich people to make more money, as this package will.

Workers are wondering in this country what happened to the American dream. They feel squeezed. They feel desperate. They do not know how they are going to take care of their parents and put their kids through an education at the same time. And I think the answer can be found in some Federal Reserve numbers. I do not happen to think much of Alan Greenspan's interest rate policy; I do think a lot of their ability to analyze where wealth has gone in this economy.

And what they have pointed out is that in the 1980's, or rather before the 1980's, or 3 decades following World War II, when workers productivity increased, they got that full productivity reflected in increased wages.

During the 1970's, workers got about half their productivity increases reflected in wages. During the 1980's and 1990's, worker productivity went up while wages went down. Productivity went up 18 percent; wages fell by 7 percent in real dollar terms.

Where did that money go? I will tell you where it went. If you exclude homes and cars from the net assets of households, nine-tenths of the increased wealth of this society in the 1980's went to the richest one-tenth of American families. But even more striking is the fact that the richest one half of 1 percent of households got 60 percent of the increase in individually held financial assets.

The half-million richest households increased their average net worth from \$8.7 million to \$12.7 million in those 6 years and as a group, their net worth increased by \$2 trillion, which is more than twice the entire increase in the national debt during that same period.

So that is where the American dream has gone. It has gone into the pockets of some of the wealthiest people in this society. And with all due respect, I do

not believe that this bill ought to add to their wealth at the expense of the middle-class and the workers in this country and that is what I suggest this bill is doing.

So, my colleagues can vote for it if they want, but do not pretend that the Brewster language is in here. It is not. They are taking the money which this House voted to use for deficit reduction and they are using it instead to finance tax cuts.

That is why we will use the previous question on the rule to try to break the stranglehold which the majority party has on this process. And if we are able to defeat the previous question on the rule, we will offer an amendment to reinstitute the Brewster amendment which will require that all of the dollars that are saved in this package go for deficit reduction. That is where you voted to put it in the first place, that is where we tried to put it in the first place, and that is where it ought to go tonight and that is where I hope you are willing to put it.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, when my colleague discussed the movement of wealth to the upper income earners in the 1980's, in order to get that adjustment we have to include 1979 and 1980 in that equation, because if we take 1979 and 1980 out and use only 1981 through 1989, we do not get that same equation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am using the numbers in the Federal Reserve gathered data. They selected the breakpoints. And, I mean, you can define it any way you want, but does the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER] really deny that worker income has gone down in this country while corporate profits have hit record highs?

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I do not deny that worker income has gone down. Most of that has to do with the increased tax burdens, the take-home pay is eaten up by tax burdens.

Would the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] agree that when we talk about the top 20 percent or the top half, we are talking about different people. We may talk about averages over a period of time, but the same people in the richest one-half or the one-tenth in 1990 were not the same people in 1980. For example, the richest person in the United States today was poor and broke in 1980.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, the gentleman can cite any individual anomalies he desires, but all we have to do is ask the average worker on the street whether they think the rich have gotten richer while everybody else has stood still and we know that the answer will be. The answer will be, "You betcha."

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California, [Mr. DREIER]

has 9½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILEN-SON] has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILEN-SON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

(Mr. VENTO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rescission rule and frankly this rule would not even be needed if the rules of the House were being properly followed. Obviously, the fact is that they are not and this process is being abused.

The Republicans have decided to use the rescission process to make political points. That is what is going on here. They decided to jam through a number of policy changes that require the rule and need protection under the rule, not to go through the normal authorization and enactment process between the House and Senate and, further, to hold the disaster assistance programs hostage to a selective number of cuts.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important and should be recognized by all concerned that most of these cuts come out of a very select group of programs. Most of them, in fact, were targeted at the very programs that the new administration put in place after a long-fought battle in 1993 and 1994; its programs like the National Service Program and Goals 2000 that are proposed to be cut, which has been just partially restored in this particular equation today.

But the fact is that the Republicans are negotiating with themselves. They are going down and saying, This is the list of proposals. This is what we are going to do. There is no agreement. They are saying, Let us try it this way, if we can get by with this set of changes.

There was no negotiation with the minority in the initial instance of this rescission bill and this disaster bill and there is no negotiation today and there is no agreement with the House minority. And, furthermore, some of the provisions that are being put in here are egregious.

They repeal decades of law that have stood and do work. The fact is with regards to the harvest program, the salvage program in the Pacific Northwest and across the country where this applies, it applies across the country, the fact is that a salvage forest health program and such policies have been put in place by the Clinton administration and Forest Chief Thomas, in December of 1994, before the GOP even assumed power.

□ 1715

And the fact is that such forest health program will work within limits. But what does this particular bill do? Well, this waives all the environmental laws. That is essentially correct—all environmental laws. A spe-

cific particular provision waives the Small Business Act so that they do not have to observe that. A particular provision in the bill waives the deficit timber sale which my colleague from Wisconsin is concerned about.

That fact is that this particular provision in this bill will in the end cost money. Timber prices are high today, but if you look at this in the long term view, you recognize that forest health is not what is being pursued here. Forest health is the excuse not the goal in this measure. What is being pursued is a quick harvest of some timber, getting in the receipts, then we have to share 25 percent of the receipts with the local government, which, again, costs the Federal Government money, plus we do not even include road construction in the budget analysis of what goes on.

Many of these areas are areas today that are roadless areas. They are roadless areas. It does not provide the other dollars needed to deal with the entire forest health question in terms of watershed restoration or selective tree harvest or thinning or reforestation, prescribed burning which are most of the elements that have to be done as part of forest health. So the quick buck, and then we pick up a big deficit down the road in dollars and lost natural resources.

Plus, of course, I think it is important to know this will destroy, of course, a great legacy, a great American natural resource legacy in this country. This is one of the many steps being taken which represent an assault by this new majority on the environmental laws and on the natural resources of this Nation, and that is not what the people voted for in November, Mr. Speaker. They voted, I think, I think they thought they were voting for some people that had still a conservation ethic, but we have yet to see the conservation ethic in these so-called conservatives.

Mr. Speaker, it has been one assault after the other on a whole series of environmental laws. The whole regulatory scheme tends to be that. This is an outrageous proposal that is before us. It is not one that has received compromise in terms of the overall rescission bill, the overall disaster assistance bill.

We know those funds are desperately needed for the people in California. We also recognize they should not be coming out of the backs of those others that need these programs in education and social areas and senior citizens' heating programs across the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the timber salvage provision in this rescission bill had a bad odor the first time around and does not smell any better today. This provision is an outright assault on our public forests and environmental laws. There is absolutely no legitimate or desirable reason to go forth with the timber salvage provision. One can only conclude that this Congress is prepared to sell off our national forests to the timber industry.

This provision should be labeled for what it is—a boon to the timber industry, a revenue loser for the American taxpayer, and the permanent destruction of more of our American landscapes, the ecosystems and forest legacy.

The timber salvage provision pretends to address forest health problems and reduce forest fire potential. However, both arguments are transparent cover for exploiting our forests when held up to the light of day. The fig leaves used to cover up and justify such action, should get the authors arrested for indecent exposure.

This timber salvage language is simply a denial of the facts affecting forest ecosystems and the forest industry. Such an approach sacrifices long term common sense resource management for instant gratification—savaging not salvaging our national forests and costing precious taxpayer dollars and the legacy of future generations.

Perhaps the ultimate affront to the American people is the way in which this bill has been handled. By attaching these unacceptable amendments to the rescissions bill, some of our colleagues are using legislative extortion to lard a supposed budget cutting bill with budget busting programs.

These covert assaults on environmental protection have been a wake up call to citizens across the country who may have voted for change but did not vote for the exploitation and giveaway of their natural legacy. Passage of this bill would signal a serious problem about how our Government operates.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend, the great natural resource happens to be dead trees in those surrounding communities where the potential for fire is very great. They do not consider it a marvelous resource.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Sugar Land, TX [Mr. DELAY], the distinguished Republican whip and a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I appreciate the work that he is doing.

Frankly, I respect the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]. He really believes in the world as he sees it. I just see it from a different pair of eyes, and I think the American people do, too, as evidenced in the election last November.

The gentleman said the people, or he thought the people voted the way they did to make the two parties work together. I do not think that was it at all. I think the American people saw the party that was in power was driving them into such debt that they rejected everything that they stand for and did a historic thing and put the Republicans in power for the first time in 40 years.

This whole process that we find ourselves in now is a perfect example of

that. It is a perfect example of that. The President of the United States, in trying to become relevant to this process, presented to this body a request to pay for some disaster relief in California, and then the Oklahoma City disaster happened during the process, so he added that and other things that we desperately needed to pay for.

This body, under a new majority, took advantage of the situation to take care of some rescissions and spending that needed to be corrected this year. A lot of the spending in these rescissions are spending that would never be done this year, so we took advantage of that and set that aside, huge accounts in the HUD account that have been building up over the years but not obligated; a lot of this money is funds that cannot be obligated by the end of September. So we took advantage of that.

We sent the President a bill that got some significant real savings, and along with paying for, and always paying for, not adding to the deficit, those kinds of relief problems.

So we got to this point, and the President vetoes the bill, not out of substance, out of politics, out of politics. The President wanted to become relevant. He knew he was irrelevant in this process because he has chosen to be irrelevant, because he has not been part of the negotiation process of this bill. They have not told us what they wanted except to pay for this disaster relief. So the President vetoes and says, "I want all of this good spending, like adult job training."

Mr. Speaker, we have got hundreds of adult job training programs that are going on and were not stopped under the rescission bill, but the President wanted to add another \$40 million. He wanted Goals 2000. Most of the American people are against Goals 2000. So he puts in another \$60 million. Safe and drug-free schools, that may be okay. He tried to put back midnight basketball, something the American people overwhelmingly oppose. He wanted \$10 million for that. And I could go on through this, safe-drinking-water money, \$225 million. That cannot possibly be spent between now and the end of September. But he wanted to be the safe-drinking-water President.

This is a headline President and the talking point President. When you look under what he is talking about, you see there is no substance there at all. It is all politics.

Then he started pounding his chest about too much pork in this bill, had a bunch of Federal courthouses in here, "and I want to eliminate it." We asked him where are the courthouses? He has never yet given us a list of the courthouses.

Do you know what the President wanted? \$348 million cut out of the rescission bill and hand over to give the General Services Administration the opportunity to pick and choose where they think the courthouses ought to be cut. That is not the way the process works.

So now we find ourselves trying to pass a bill that gives us \$9.2 billion worth of real savings to the American family, plus an extra \$30 million in change and give back the President the opportunity to do some of his pork and his spending programs that have not proven to be effective, and he is still against the bill and still will not tell us what he is for.

That is not relevancy, ladies and gentlemen, it is not cutting spending to finance tax cuts. It is cutting spending to downsize the size of this Government so the American family can hang on to more of their hard-earned dollars.

The reason the family is having problems, Mr. Speaker, is that they are paying 52 percent of their income to the Government.

Support the rule and support the bill.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, I oppose this legislation for a number of reasons. But I have one that is parochial to Montana, and maybe to any of you who have visited Montana or any of you that care about that place which Americans call the last best place. That isn't our name for Montana, by the way. We call it Big Sky country. But Americans have called it the last best place. When we Montanans say that, we say it, not only with pride, but also with some sorrow.

One of the reasons Montana is the last best place is because we still have enormous wilderness areas out there, untrammelled, unroaded, with the great remaining wild land animals migrating and habitating through them and in them.

When this bill first came through the House, I thought there was simply an error in it, because it placed, naked to logging, a million acres of Montana that this House has voted to place in wilderness. We did so because the land had the highest characteristics of wilderness. Republicans and Democrats, as early as just a year ago in this House, voted overwhelmingly, 300 of us and more, to place 1,100,000 acres under protection from logging, and now this bill would open those areas to logging.

I do not think you could find 2 dozen Members of this House who would do that. And so we went to the Republican leadership. We tried to get them to change it. They would not do it. We went to the White House. I went to the White House. The White House agreed. The administration thought it was just an error and asked for compromise but they were refused.

Now, let me further explain. The 1,100,000 acres that this House has voted to protect from logging has not become law. But do we really want our prerogative removed to eventually declare these areas wilderness or otherwise protect them. The answer is "no." This House does not want to do that.

Yet this bill removes our prerogative by allowing logging in those areas. If

you came with me, I say to both sides of the aisle, and flew over or walked through those areas, you would come back here and say, "This bill is a mistake. We should not have done it." And yet we are going to do it.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. You mentioned this bill would allow us to log the salvage harvest in wilderness or areas designated as wilderness.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, I did not say that. This is important to understand. I said areas this House has voted to put in wilderness but have not yet been signed into law.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. If the gentleman will yield, those areas would be designated areas.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Brevard, NC [Mr. TAYLOR], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's statement, and I do not doubt his sincerity, is wrong. I authored this bill, and it does not affect areas of wilderness or areas designated as wilderness, and the Secretary, if he has any idea that this House has acted on any wilderness, we cannot do salvage timber in it. Salvage can only be performed in that small 20 to 25 percent of the national forest where harvest is now allowed, and that is not allowed in areas either set aside as wildernesses or designated as wilderness.

Let me go on, because I want to move on with two other particular points.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the gentleman will yield, I will just tell the gentleman that is not the issue. The issue is the gentleman is missing the point.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. First of all, the cry for the environment is really hollow. If you go downstairs and look at Brandeis's quote on stone, it says, "The greatest threat to liberty, lives, and the efforts of men of zeal, well-meaning but without understanding," and I have never seen a situation as misunderstood as this salvage bill. We all know that we make products from wood. All these desks and chairs and so forth can be made from wood, plastic, or steel. If we do away with our forest harvest program in this country, that is the ultimate goal, then we must rely on finite products, and plastic must be oil we bring into the country, imported, we spill it two or three times along the way. How can that be a plus for the environment?

We are now harvesting 16 billion board feet, a third of our forest products from sensitive environmental areas all over the world. What about the great hue and cry about rainforest? That is where a lot of our 16 billion board feet are coming from. We have no control over that.

We do have substantial control in our own forest, and a great many environ-

mental controls. The forest health is a third important goal that we are going after. North Carolina State University, a respected university, with the largest school of forestry, over 100 years of silvicultural study and the largest extension program, recently pointed out in a statement that this salvage amendment is absolutely for forest health.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ANDREWS].

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in 1992 and again in 1994, millions of Americans went to the polls and demanded fundamental change in what they called politics as usual. In 1992 they turned out an incumbent President, gave him only 38 percent of their vote. In 1994, as we well know, they turned out the majority in the House of Representatives and gave it to the new majority.

I wonder what those voters would say if they understood what was in this rule that is before us this afternoon. I wonder what they would say if they knew that their majority was about to spend \$7 billion and cut \$16 billion in a bill that was not even on this floor this morning when we went about our business, and many of us are reading it for the first time right now. I wonder what they would say if they knew that an important question which we just heard some debate about between the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS], about whether or not to log on federally owned lands, whether to permit timber practice on federally owned lands was not even going to be debated in this bill, that there will be one single up-down vote on the whole bill, and the debate that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] had will not get a vote, because the rule does not permit it.

I wonder what they would say if they knew that this bill took money out of the program that we used to help senior citizens pay their heating bill and their air-conditioning bill.

□ 1730

At the same time it forgives a \$275 million loan owed to the United States by the Government of Jordan. I wonder what they would say if they heard, Mr. Speaker, that we could not debate and take a separate vote on that. I think they would say that that is politics as usual. I think they would say that is exactly what they voted against in 1992 and 1994.

I do not know what the right answers are to those questions, Mr. Speaker, but I sure do know that those questions should be debated on this floor and voted on this floor, and my colleagues know, and I know, they will not be

under the terms of this rule, and that, Mr. Speaker, is why I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this suppressive and wrong-headed rule.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, Deficit hawks, if you were moved by the Budget Committee chairman's speech on the conference report on the budget resolution, as I was, you'll love this. We can do more to enact real and fair deficit reduction in this bill than we could in that one. How? By defeating the previous question so that the Brewster-Harman bipartisan lockbox amendment can be made in order.

Please join our effort. Otherwise another opportunity will be missed to allow our colleagues to vote on spending cuts that actually reduce the Federal deficit.

Let me cite an example for my colleagues. During Tuesday's consideration of the foreign operations appropriation bill, Mr. Speaker, our colleagues support cuts totaling \$65.069 million. Regrettably not one penny went to deficit reduction. Instead, under the budget rules, the funds freed up by these cut amendments will be re-allocated by the Committee on Appropriations on other spending programs. I say to my colleagues, When you add in the \$20-plus million in cuts we made in the military construction appropriations bill and yesterday's cuts, those cuts total over a hundred million dollars that don't go to deficit reduction.

Mr. Speaker, we voted on the lockbox in March on a bill similar to the one we are considering now. The House vote was 418 to 5, including all members of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to defeat the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule that makes in order the Brewster-Harman bipartisan lockbox amendment in place of the weaker version contained in section 2003 and 2004 of this bill.

Vote "no" on the previous question. It is the only way to get a vote in the House on the real lockbox.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the text of the amendment we would offer at this point:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 176

On page 2, line 8 strike "tions. That amendment" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "tions and an amendment offered by Representative Brewster of Oklahoma and Representative Harman of California. Those amendments"

On page 2, line 11, strike "that amendment" and insert in lieu thereof "those amendments".

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Atlanta, GA [Mr. LINDER].

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, the problem with cutting back on spending is

nobody wants to cut. We all talk about it, but nobody wants to cut, to cut. The gentleman from New Jersey said, "Just think. We're cutting heating oil help for the elderly to give away money to Jordan." The heating oil help for the elderly was a 1979 program for a temporary relief when the oil prices were way up. The oil prices are today below where they were then, but we cannot even cut that program out now. Now it is an entitlement.

The loan forgiveness to Jordan was negotiated by the Secretary of State. It is part of the peace process with Israel. It was signed by this President. Indeed the President did not think we forgave at all, and he was very upset, and called Israel, and complained about the Republicans in Congress not doing what he wanted to keep the process going, and I know that the gentleman from New Jersey is in support of the peace process with Israel and the Middle East because I heard him talk about it to two Jewish groups myself.

We simply have to get away from protecting individual programs and begin to cut spending for our children's future.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I really think that this is an historical bill. First of all, we are still trying to find out what it really says because it just got here. There are 119 pages. But as I glance through this summary, and, if it is wrong, I wish somebody would point it out, I must say we really need to vote down this rule and get to correcting it.

No. 1, it appears from my summary that we are still taking \$50 million out of veterans' medical care, \$50 million, and this is the week where people came to the floor and talked about the flag. This is the year where everybody has been celebrating World War II celebrations and all of these things. But as I look at this list, what we are doing is taking away from medical installations around this country much-needed equipment that keeps them in the state-of-the-art health care for people who put their health and their lives on the line for this great country and this great flag.

So, as my colleagues know, this is the substance of what this flag stands for, that when we tell veterans we are going to take care of them, we are really taking care of them, we do not get rid of it.

Well, the first thing that jumps off the page at me is that, and I do not see anybody disputing that that is wrong, so I guess that is true.

I also see us going after education big-time in here. I see that we are continuing to zero out the math and science training, the technology—

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, because at the

request of the President actually this increases the money for adult job training, School to Work, Goals 2000, which is an education program, safe and drug-free schools, drug courts, the phases, TRIO, the child-care block grant program. With the Goals 2000 it is specifically education.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Reclaiming my time, mine shows—it says that it was not cut as much as it was the last time. In other words, instead of cutting it \$92 million, it was only cut \$32 million.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. This still cuts \$574 million from education.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. That is exactly how I read it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, to close the debate on our side, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN], a very able Member of this Congress.

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding this time to me and allowing me to close. I rise to support the rule, and do so with a perspective that might be different from most Republicans.

I say to my colleagues, "You might remember that first rescission package I voted against. I identified two key provisions of it, LIHEAP, low-income heating assistance, and summer jobs, that were important to my district, and after voting against that, I worked with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to restore those in the conference report. We restored those in the conference report, and so I voted for that compromise version."

But while I was willing to identify the cuts that I thought we should make and the spending that I thought we should keep, President Clinton still has not signed his name to a package of spending cuts that he would support. He keeps saying things like, well, he likes the Senate version better, but he will not say what cuts he will support, what \$9 billion, or \$10 billion, or whatever number he likes. So the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has been negotiating, but not able to make progress.

So, when I listen to my friend on the other side of the aisle saying, well, we wanted this point change and that point change, I say, "Why don't you go to the President and ask him to include those in whatever spending-cut bill he would like to recommend, because as of this point in time the President has not signed onto any spending cut at all."

I applaud the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for going the extra mile, saying we will give the President some of the things he said he would like to increase spending on, but for our children's future we have to cut spending.

So I would ask all Members to vote yes on the rule, vote yes on the rescis-

sion package itself, a first step to protecting our children.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). The gentleman from California is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to urge the Members to vote against the rule and against the previous question. It is an unfair rule, it is a closed rule, and, if the previous question is defeated, we shall offer, as Members have heard, an alternative rule that makes in order the Brewster-Harman bipartisan lockbox amendment.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote for this very fair and balanced rule, and the conference report, and the previous question, and on any other procedural vote they might request on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 194, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 459]  
YEAS—236

|              |              |               |
|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Allard       | Canady       | Ensign        |
| Archer       | Castle       | Everett       |
| Armey        | Chabot       | Ewing         |
| Bachus       | Chambliss    | Fawell        |
| Baker (CA)   | Chenoweth    | Fields (TX)   |
| Baker (LA)   | Christensen  | Flanagan      |
| Ballenger    | Chrysler     | Foley         |
| Barr         | Clinger      | Forbes        |
| Barrett (NE) | Coble        | Fowler        |
| Bartlett     | Coburn       | Fox           |
| Barton       | Collins (GA) | Franks (CT)   |
| Bass         | Combest      | Franks (NJ)   |
| Bateman      | Cooley       | Frelinghuysen |
| Beilenson    | Cox          | Frisa         |
| Bereuter     | Crane        | Funderburk    |
| Bilbray      | Crapo        | Galleghy      |
| Bilirakis    | Cremeans     | Ganske        |
| Bliley       | Cubin        | Gekas         |
| Blute        | Cunningham   | Gilchrest     |
| Boehlert     | Davis        | Gillmor       |
| Boehner      | Deal         | Gilman        |
| Bonilla      | DeLay        | Goodlatte     |
| Bono         | Diaz-Balart  | Goodling      |
| Brownback    | Dickey       | Goss          |
| Bryant (TN)  | Doolittle    | Graham        |
| Bunn         | Dornan       | Greenwood     |
| Bunning      | Dreier       | Gunderson     |
| Burr         | Duncan       | Gutknecht     |
| Burton       | Dunn         | Hall (TX)     |
| Buyer        | Ehlers       | Hancock       |
| Callahan     | Ehrlich      | Hansen        |
| Calvert      | Emerson      | Hastert       |
| Camp         | English      | Hastings (WA) |

Hayworth  
Hefley  
Heineman  
Herger  
Hilleary  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Istook  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaHood  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Laughlin  
Lazio  
Leach  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lightfoot  
Linder  
Livingston  
LoBiondo  
Longley  
Lucas  
Manzullo  
Martini  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McDade

McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntosh  
McKeon  
Metcalf  
Meyers  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Molinari  
Moorhead  
Morella  
Myers  
Myrick  
Nethercutt  
Neumann  
Ney  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oxley  
Packard  
Parker  
Paxon  
Petri  
Pombo  
Porter  
Portman  
Pryce  
Quillen  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Riggs  
Roberts  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roth  
Roukema  
Royce  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaefer  
Schiff

NAYS—194

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Andrews  
Baesler  
Baldacci  
Barcia  
Barrett (WI)  
Becerra  
Bentsen  
Berman  
Bevill  
Bishop  
Bonior  
Borski  
Boucher  
Brewster  
Browder  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Bryant (TX)  
Cardin  
Chapman  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Coleman  
Collins (IL)  
Collins (MI)  
Condit  
Conyers  
Costello  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Danner  
de la Garza  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
Dellums  
Deutsch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Evans

Farr  
Fattah  
Fazio  
Fields (LA)  
Filner  
Flake  
Foglietta  
Ford  
Frank (MA)  
Frost  
Furse  
Gejdenson  
Gephardt  
Geren  
Gibbons  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Green  
Gutierrez  
Hall (OH)  
Hamilton  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Hayes  
Hefner  
Hilliard  
Hinchey  
Holden  
Hoyer  
Jackson-Lee  
Jacobs  
Jefferson  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnston  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy (MA)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kleczka  
Klink  
LaFalce  
Lantos  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lincoln  
Lipinski  
Lofgren  
Lowey

Luther  
Maloney  
Manton  
Markey  
Martinez  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McDermott  
McHale  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek  
Menendez  
Mfume  
Miller (CA)  
Mineta  
Minge  
Mink  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moran  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Neal  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Orton  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pastor  
Payne (NJ)  
Payne (VA)  
Pelosi  
Peterson (FL)  
Peterson (MN)  
Pickett  
Pomeroy  
Poshard  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reed  
Richardson  
Rivers  
Roemer  
Rose  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush

Sabro  
Sanders  
Sawyer  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Scott  
Serrano  
Sisisky  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Solomon  
Souder  
Spence  
Stearns  
Stockman  
Stump  
Talent  
Tate  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Torkildsen  
Traficant  
Upton  
Vucanovich  
Waldholtz  
Walker  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
White  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wolf  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

Durbin  
Largent

Stokes  
Studds  
Stupak  
Tanner  
Tejeda  
Thompson  
Thornton  
Thurman  
Torres  
Torrice  
Towns  
Tucker  
Velazquez  
Vento

NOT VOTING—4

Moakley  
Reynolds

□ 1801

Mr. SOLOMON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote whereby the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). Did the gentleman vote on the prevailing side?

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BEILENSEN moves to reconsider the vote on which the previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. DREIER

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] to lay on the table the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 193, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 460]

AYES—235

Allard  
Archer  
Armey  
Bachus  
Baker (CA)  
Baker (LA)  
Ballenger  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bateman  
Bereuter  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bilely  
Blute  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bono  
Brownback  
Bryant (TN)

Bunn  
Bunning  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Canady  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chenoweth  
Christensen  
Chryslers  
Clinger  
Coble  
Coburn  
Collins (GA)  
Combest  
Cooley  
Cox  
Crane  
Crapo

Cremeans  
Cubin  
Cunningham  
Davis  
Deal  
DeLay  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Doolittle  
Dornan  
Dreier  
Dunn  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
English  
Engel  
Everett  
Ewing  
Fawell  
Fields (TX)  
Flanagan  
Foley  
Forbes

Fowler  
Fox  
Franks (CT)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frisa  
Funderburk  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gekas  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Goss  
Graham  
Greenwood  
Gunderson  
Gutknecht  
Hall (TX)  
Hamilton  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Heineman  
Herger  
Hilleary  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Istook  
Jacobs  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaHood  
Latham

LaTourette  
Laughlin  
Lazio  
Leach  
LoBiondo  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Longley  
Lucas  
Manzullo  
Martini  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McDade

LaTourette  
Laughlin  
Lazio  
Leach  
LoBiondo  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Longley  
Lucas  
Manzullo  
Martini  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McDade

Roth  
Roukema  
Royce  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaefer  
Schiff

NOES—193

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Andrews  
Baesler  
Baldacci  
Barcia  
Barrett (WI)  
Becerra  
Beilenson  
Bentsen  
Berman  
Bevill  
Bishop  
Bonior  
Borski  
Boucher  
Brewster  
Browder  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Bryant (TX)  
Chapman  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Coleman  
Collins (IL)  
Collins (MI)  
Condit  
Conyers  
Costello  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Danner  
de la Garza  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
Dellums  
Deutsch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fazio  
Fields (LA)  
Filner  
Flake  
Foglietta  
Ford  
Frank (MA)  
Frost  
Furse  
Gejdenson  
Gephardt  
Geren  
Gibbons  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Green  
Gutierrez  
Hall (OH)  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Hayes  
Hefner  
Hilliard  
Hinchey  
Holden  
Hoyer  
Jackson-Lee  
Jefferson  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, E. B.

Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fazio  
Fields (LA)  
Filner  
Flake  
Foglietta  
Ford  
Frank (MA)  
Frost  
Furse  
Gejdenson  
Gephardt  
Geren  
Gibbons  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Green  
Gutierrez  
Hall (OH)  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Hayes  
Hefner  
Hilliard  
Hinchey  
Holden  
Hoyer  
Jackson-Lee  
Jefferson  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, E. B.

Johnston  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy (MA)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kleczka  
Klink  
LaFalce  
Lantos  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lincoln  
Lipinski  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Luther  
Maloney  
Manton  
Markey  
Martinez  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McDermott  
McHale  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek  
Menendez  
Mfume  
Miller (CA)  
Mineta  
Minge  
Mink  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moran  
Murtha  
Nadler

|               |               |            |
|---------------|---------------|------------|
| Neal          | Roybal-Allard | Thornton   |
| Oberstar      | Rush          | Thurman    |
| Obey          | Sabo          | Torres     |
| Olver         | Sanders       | Torricelli |
| Ortiz         | Sawyer        | Towns      |
| Orton         | Schroeder     | Tucker     |
| Owens         | Schumer       | Velazquez  |
| Pallone       | Scott         | Vento      |
| Pastor        | Serrano       | Visclosky  |
| Payne (NJ)    | Sisisky       | Volkmer    |
| Payne (VA)    | Skaggs        | Ward       |
| Pelosi        | Skelton       | Waters     |
| Peterson (FL) | Slaughter     | Watt (NC)  |
| Peterson (MN) | Spratt        | Waxman     |
| Pickett       | Stark         | Williams   |
| Pomeroy       | Stenholm      | Wilson     |
| Poshard       | Stokes        | Wise       |
| Rahall        | Studds        | Woolsey    |
| Rangel        | Stupak        | Wyden      |
| Reed          | Tanner        | Wynm       |
| Richardson    | Taylor (MS)   | Yates      |
| Rivers        | Tejeda        |            |
| Rose          | Thompson      |            |

NOT VOTING—6

|        |         |          |
|--------|---------|----------|
| Duncan | Hastert | Moakley  |
| Durbin | Largent | Reynolds |

□ 1819

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

1995 RESCISSION AND DISASTER SUPPLEMENTAL BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 234, noes, 192, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 461]

AYES—234

|              |              |               |
|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Allard       | Buyer        | Doolittle     |
| Archer       | Callahan     | Dornan        |
| Armey        | Calvert      | Dreier        |
| Bachus       | Camp         | Duncan        |
| Baker (CA)   | Canady       | Dunn          |
| Baker (LA)   | Castle       | Ehlers        |
| Ballenger    | Chabot       | Ehrlich       |
| Barr         | Chambliss    | Emerson       |
| Barrett (NE) | Chenoweth    | English       |
| Bartlett     | Christensen  | Ensign        |
| Barton       | Chrysler     | Everett       |
| Bass         | Clinger      | Ewing         |
| Bateman      | Coble        | Fawell        |
| Bereuter     | Coburn       | Fields (TX)   |
| Bilbray      | Collins (GA) | Flanagan      |
| Bilirakis    | Combest      | Foley         |
| Bliley       | Cooley       | Forbes        |
| Blute        | Cox          | Fowler        |
| Boehlert     | Crane        | Fox           |
| Boehner      | Crapo        | Franks (NJ)   |
| Bonilla      | Creameans    | Frelinghuysen |
| Bono         | Cubin        | Frisa         |
| Brownback    | Cunningham   | Funderburk    |
| Bryant (TN)  | Davis        | Galleghy      |
| Bunn         | Deal         | Ganske        |
| Bunning      | DeLay        | Gekas         |
| Burr         | Diaz-Balart  | Gilchrest     |
| Burton       | Dickey       | Gillmor       |

|               |              |               |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| Gilman        | Livingston   | Salmon        |
| Goodlatte     | LoBiondo     | Sanford       |
| Goodling      | Longley      | Saxton        |
| Goss          | Lucas        | Scarborough   |
| Graham        | Manzullo     | Schaefer      |
| Greenwood     | Martini      | Schiff        |
| Handerson     | McCollum     | Seastrand     |
| Gutknecht     | McCrery      | Sensenbrenner |
| Hall (TX)     | McDade       | Shadegg       |
| Hancock       | McHugh       | Shaw          |
| Hansen        | McInnis      | Shays         |
| Hastert       | McIntosh     | Shuster       |
| Hastings (WA) | McKeon       | Skeen         |
| Hayworth      | Metcalf      | Smith (MI)    |
| Hefley        | Meyers       | Smith (NJ)    |
| Heineman      | Mica         | Smith (TX)    |
| Hерger        | Miller (FL)  | Smith (WA)    |
| Hilleary      | Molinari     | Solomon       |
| Hobson        | Montgomery   | Souder        |
| Hoekstra      | Moorhead     | Spence        |
| Horn          | Morella      | Stearns       |
| Hostettler    | Myers        | Stockman      |
| Houghton      | Myrick       | Stump         |
| Hunter        | Nethercutt   | Talent        |
| Hutchinson    | Neumann      | Tate          |
| Hyde          | Ney          | Tauzin        |
| Inglis        | Norwood      | Taylor (MS)   |
| Istook        | Nussle       | Thomas        |
| Johnson (CT)  | Oxley        | Thornberry    |
| Johnson, Sam  | Packard      | Tiahrt        |
| Johnston      | Parker       | Torkildsen    |
| Jones         | Paxon        | Trafigant     |
| Kasich        | Petri        | Upton         |
| Kelly         | Pombo        | Vucanovich    |
| Kim           | Porter       | Waldholtz     |
| King          | Portman      | Walker        |
| Kingston      | Pryce        | Walsh         |
| Klug          | Quillen      | Wamp          |
| Knollenberg   | Quinn        | Watts (OK)    |
| Kolbe         | Radanovich   | Weldon (FL)   |
| LaHood        | Ramstad      | Weldon (PA)   |
| Latham        | Regula       | Weller        |
| LaTourette    | Riggs        | White         |
| Laughlin      | Roberts      | Whitfield     |
| Lazio         | Rogers       | Wicker        |
| Leach         | Rohrabacher  | Wolf          |
| Lewis (CA)    | Ros-Lehtinen | Young (AK)    |
| Lewis (KY)    | Roth         | Young (FL)    |
| Lightfoot     | Roukema      | Zeliff        |
| Linder        | Royce        | Zimmer        |

NOES—192

|              |                |               |
|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| Abercrombie  | Doyle          | Lantos        |
| Ackerman     | Edwards        | Levin         |
| Andrews      | Engel          | Lewis (GA)    |
| Baesler      | Eshoo          | Lincoln       |
| Baldacci     | Evans          | Lipinski      |
| Barcia       | Farr           | Lofgren       |
| Barrett (WI) | Fattah         | Lowey         |
| Becerra      | Fazio          | Luther        |
| Beilenson    | Filner         | Maloney       |
| Bentsen      | Flake          | Manton        |
| Berman       | Foglietta      | Markey        |
| Bevill       | Ford           | Martinez      |
| Bishop       | Frank (MA)     | Mascara       |
| Bonior       | Frost          | Matsui        |
| Borski       | Furse          | McCarthy      |
| Boucher      | Gejdenson      | McDermott     |
| Brewster     | Gephardt       | McHale        |
| Browder      | Geren          | McKinney      |
| Brown (CA)   | Gibbons        | McNulty       |
| Brown (FL)   | Gonzalez       | Meehan        |
| Brown (OH)   | Gordon         | Meek          |
| Bryant (TX)  | Green          | Menendez      |
| Cardin       | Gutierrez      | Mfume         |
| Chapman      | Hall (OH)      | Miller (CA)   |
| Clay         | Hamilton       | Mineta        |
| Clayton      | Harman         | Minge         |
| Clement      | Hastings (FL)  | Mink          |
| Clyburn      | Hayes          | Mollohan      |
| Coleman      | Hefner         | Moran         |
| Collins (IL) | Hilliard       | Murtha        |
| Collins (MI) | Hinchey        | Nadler        |
| Condit       | Holden         | Neal          |
| Conyers      | Hoyer          | Oberstar      |
| Costello     | Jackson-Lee    | Obey          |
| Coyne        | Jacobs         | Olver         |
| Cramer       | Jefferson      | Ortiz         |
| Danner       | Johnson (SD)   | Orton         |
| de la Garza  | Johnson, E. B. | Owens         |
| DeFazio      | Kanjorski      | Pallone       |
| DeLauro      | Kaptur         | Pastor        |
| Dellums      | Kennedy (MA)   | Payne (NJ)    |
| Deutsch      | Kennedy (RI)   | Payne (VA)    |
| Dicks        | Kennelly       | Pelosi        |
| Dingell      | Kildee         | Peterson (FL) |
| Dixon        | Klecza         | Peterson (MN) |
| Doggett      | Klink          | Pickett       |
| Dooley       | LaFalce        | Pomeroy       |

|               |            |           |
|---------------|------------|-----------|
| Poshard       | Sisisky    | Towns     |
| Rahall        | Skaggs     | Tucker    |
| Rangel        | Skelton    | Velazquez |
| Reed          | Slaughter  | Vento     |
| Richardson    | Spratt     | Visclosky |
| Rivers        | Stark      | Volkmer   |
| Roemer        | Stenholm   | Ward      |
| Rose          | Stokes     | Waters    |
| Roybal-Allard | Studds     | Watt (NC) |
| Rush          | Stupak     | Waxman    |
| Sabo          | Tanner     | Williams  |
| Sanders       | Tejeda     | Wilson    |
| Sawyer        | Thompson   | Wise      |
| Schroeder     | Thornton   | Woolsey   |
| Schumer       | Thurman    | Wyden     |
| Scott         | Torres     | Wynn      |
| Serrano       | Torricelli | Yates     |

NOT VOTING—8

|             |         |             |
|-------------|---------|-------------|
| Durbin      | Hoke    | Reynolds    |
| Fields (LA) | Largent | Taylor (NC) |
| Franks (CT) | Moakley |             |

□ 1829

Mr. DE LA GARZA changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

□ 1830

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I object. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). Objection is heard.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the House agreed to House Resolution 176.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 189, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No 462]

AYES—236

|              |              |             |
|--------------|--------------|-------------|
| Allard       | Burr         | Davis       |
| Archer       | Burton       | Deal        |
| Armey        | Buyer        | DeLay       |
| Bachus       | Callahan     | Diaz-Balart |
| Baker (CA)   | Calvert      | Dickey      |
| Baker (LA)   | Camp         | Doolittle   |
| Ballenger    | Canady       | Dornan      |
| Barr         | Castle       | Dreier      |
| Barrett (NE) | Chabot       | Duncan      |
| Bartlett     | Chambliss    | Dunn        |
| Barton       | Chenoweth    | Ehlers      |
| Bass         | Christensen  | Ehrlich     |
| Bereuter     | Chrysler     | Emerson     |
| Bilbray      | Clinger      | English     |
| Bilirakis    | Coble        | Ensign      |
| Bliley       | Coburn       | Everett     |
| Blute        | Collins (GA) | Ewing       |
| Boehlert     | Combest      | Fawell      |
| Boehner      | Cooley       | Fields (TX) |
| Bonilla      | Cox          | Flanagan    |
| Bono         | Crane        | Foley       |
| Brownback    | Crapo        | Forbes      |
| Bryant (TN)  | Creameans    | Fowler      |
| Bunn         | Cubin        | Fox         |
| Bunning      | Cunningham   | Franks (CT) |